

Amendments to the Drawings:

Please amend Figures 1 and 2 as indicated in red on the attached annotated drawing sheets. Replacement drawing sheets incorporating such amendments are filed herewith.

REMARKS

This reply is in response to the Office Action mailed on July 14, 2005 in which Claims 1-39 were rejected. With this response, Claim 33 is amended to overcome a noted informality, the title of the invention is amended and a replacement drawing sheet is submitted. In addition, a declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 is filed to overcome the rejections of the claims based upon the cited prior art references. Claims 1-39 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

I. Claim Objections

Page 2 of the Office Action objected to Claim 33 noting that Claim 33 depended upon a nonexistent Claim 40. In response, Claim 33 is amended to correctly depend from Claim 30.

II. Objection the Specification

Page 2 of the Office Action objected to the title of the invention as not being descriptive. In response, the title of the application is hereby amended to recite "Printing System Condenser." Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the title.

III. Objection to the Drawings

Page 2 of the Office Action objected to the drawings as missing output tray 42, reference numerals for output tray 42 and reference number 120 for the vapor handling system. In response Figures 1 and 2 are amended as indicated in red on the attached annotated drawing sheet to replace reference number 12 with reference number 42, indicating the illustrated output tray. Figure 2 is amended to add reference numeral 120 indicating the vapor handling system. A replacement drawing sheet incorporating such revisions is filed herewith. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claims 23, 25 and 26 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) Based Upon Anderson.

Rejection of Claims 1-4, 12-14, 18-19 and 24 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based Upon Anderson and Berg.

Rejection of Claim 5 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based Upon Anderson, Berg and Rosenfeld.

Rejection of Claim 6 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based Upon Anderson, Berg and Merrill.

Rejection of Claims 7 and 8 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based Upon Anderson, Berg and Sugikobo.

Rejection of Claim 9 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based Upon Anderson, Berg and Pagnon.

Rejection of Claims 10 and 22 Under 35 U.S. C. §103(a) Based Upon Anderson, Berg and Beauchamp.

Rejection of Claim 11 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based Upon Anderson, Berg, Beauchamp and Wang.

Rejection of Claims 15, 16, 27 and 28 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based Upon Anderson, Berg and Miller.

Rejection of Claim 29 Under 35 U.S. C. § 103(a) Based Upon Anderson, Miller and Beauchamp.

Rejection of Claim 17 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based Upon Anderson, Berg and Pan.

Rejection of Claims 20 and 21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based upon Anderson, Berg and Anami.

Rejection of Claims 30, 31, 34 and 39 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based Upon Anderson and Beauchamp.

Rejection of Claim 32 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based Upon Anderson, Beauchamp and Pagnon.

Rejection of Claim 33 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based Upon Anderson, Beauchamp and Berg.

Rejection of Claim 35 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based Upon Anderson, Beauchamp and Miller.

Rejection of Claim 36 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Based Upon Anderson, Beauchamp and Kakeno.

Rejection of Claim 37 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based Upon Anderson, Beauchamp and Pan

Rejection of Claim 38 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based Upon Anderson, Beauchamp and Russel.

Pages 3-14 of the Office Action rejected Claims 1-29 based upon various combinations of one or more of the noted references with Anderson, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,643,220. With this response, a declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 is filed herewith, establishing the invention of the subject matter of Claims 1-39 prior to March 21, 2002, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) filing date of Anderson. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 1-39 based in whole or at least in part upon Anderson, et al. be withdrawn.

The Office Action further rejected Claims 10, 11, 22, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38 and 39, at least in part based upon Beauchamp, U.S. Patent No. 6,536,863. The declaration filed under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 further establishes the invention of subject matter of such claims prior to January 31, 2002, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) filing date of Beauchamp, et al. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully

request that the rejection of such claims based at least in part upon Beauchamp be withdrawn.

V. Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date Oct. 14, 2005

By Todd A. Rathe

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22879
Telephone: (414) 297-5710
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Todd A. Rathe
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,276

